

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office

ed States Patent and Trademark Office ss. COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/733,748	12/07/2000	Akbar Arab-Sadeghabadi	LIT3-BL99	4786
21611 75	90 12/02/2003		EXAMINER	
SNELL & WI	LMER LLP		WANG, GI	EORGE Y
1920 MAIN ST	REET			
SUITE 1200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
IRVINE, CA	92614-7230		2871	

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	M		
	09/733.748	ARAB-SADEGHABADI ET AL.			
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	ADIETAL.		
	George Y. Wang	2871			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe			ress		
THE REPLY FILED 03 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE		•			
Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica ) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply places the applica	y to a ition in		
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date					
<ul> <li>The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailling date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).</li> </ul>	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from; (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above. If checkeds. Any reply received by the Offinmely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 or	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appr originally set in the final	opriate extension Office action; or		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) M they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note to	pelow);				
<ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	mplifying the		
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	S.		
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejec	tion(s):				
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment		
<ol> <li>The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because:</li> </ol>		dered but does NO	T place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly		
For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ⊠ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: 3,10-12 and 14-20.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)				

10. Other: \_\_\_\_

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicant amends Claim 3 with the limitation "ceramic adhesive plug" which was previously recited in Claim 9. Although this limitation was previously recited, it was never argued and therefore ultimately rejected by Examiner in Final Rejection filed 08 August 2003. The fact that Applicant did not previously amendment or even argue this limitation, which he certain could have and should have, makes is a new issue that will require further consideration.